

New York Tribune
First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements
MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1917
Entered and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York Corporation, under the name of The Tribune Association, Inc., at No. 125 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
Subscription Rates: In Advance, by Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York: 1 year, \$10.00; 6 months, \$5.50; 3 months, \$3.00. Daily and Sunday: 1 year, \$10.00; 6 months, \$5.50; 3 months, \$3.00. Foreign: 1 year, \$15.00; 6 months, \$8.00; 3 months, \$4.50. Single Copies: 5 cents.
Advertising Rates: In Advance, by Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York: 1 year, \$10.00; 6 months, \$5.50; 3 months, \$3.00. Daily and Sunday: 1 year, \$10.00; 6 months, \$5.50; 3 months, \$3.00. Foreign: 1 year, \$15.00; 6 months, \$8.00; 3 months, \$4.50. Single Copies: 5 cents.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety. If you do not, in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

Four Years More

Four years ago Woodrow Wilson took office under conditions seldom equalled in our political history. A revolution in the Republican party had swept that organization not merely out of power, but into a chaos and disarray from which it has not yet emerged. There was a great willingness all over the nation that the experiment of Democratic rule should again be tried and a great good will disclosed toward the man who took office as a Democratic President.

Few will pretend that after four years Mr. Wilson has realized the hopes or justified the faith of the country. In the presence of the greatest opportunity that any man has had since Lincoln for brave and real leadership, Mr. Wilson has found himself unable to lead, and a nation which demanded only that it might be led has again found its most patriotic impulses stifled by a President who conceived that the duty of a leader was to follow.

It is idle and it is, at the present moment, inexpedient to review the long and humiliating history of the last four years. Step by step we have descended the long staircase until we find ourselves today actually in the presence of foreign attack without preparation either materially or morally; the will to defend our fellow countrymen and our inalienable rights has become enfeebled; the courage and the capacity to face things as they are have been dissipated by the perpetual effort to avoid action by minimizing or misrepresenting facts.

It may be that Mr. Wilson has at last emerged from the shadow of past mistakes. It may be that the long and bitter lessons of the last four years have taught him that there is no escape in words from action, and that in the presence of a world storm to temporize is to multiply, not to reduce, the perils. Certainly there is given to few men the chance that Mr. Wilson will have in the next four years to atone for past failure, to undo the consequences of previous errors, to rescue his fellow countrymen from the quagmire into which he has permitted them to sink.

Three years ago Mr. Wilson told us that it was wrong to prepare for the emergencies that a new world of war and storm would inevitably bring. He had a nation, as an act of moral elevation, to refrain from arming itself. He told a nation that could not but be concerned when a battle between civilization and barbarism was going on in the world that the issues of the struggle could not interest or affect us. In the presence of that supreme crime which was the Lusitania he uttered the memorable words "Too proud to fight."

All that has happened since in Washington and in the nation, the contemptible spectacle of the last days at the Capitol, are but inevitable consequences of Mr. Wilson's course. His word and his act have paralyzed the will and obscured the vision of millions of his fellow countrymen. He has been conquered by their fears instead of inspiring them by his own courage. He has accepted the influence of the weak and the blind, instead of giving to the brave and to the informed the inspiration of true leadership.

Yet for four years that are to come Mr. Wilson will remain the sign, the symbol and the only possible force in national and international affairs. He is the single instrument through which we must work to accomplish what is to be accomplished. However much of bitterness, of humiliation, of shame, his past failures have brought upon us, the only chance that we have now of meeting the emergencies thrust upon us is that Mr. Wilson will escape from the thrall of his past folly and undertake a new period of office with a new spirit and a new vision.

If the four years that are to come disclose Mr. Wilson in the same posture as the last, he will be in our history comparable only with James Buchanan, whose weakness and timidity made the Civil War inevitable. But if the four years that are to come see Mr. Wilson at last aroused to the realities of the world in which he lives and the duties and dangers of his own nation, that which has been written will be blotted out, that which seems to-day unforfeitable will be forgotten in the minds of those who come hereafter.

No man in human history charged with great responsibilities has made more ghastly mistakes than Woodrow Wilson. No man has more terribly failed in a great crisis to represent a great nation and lead a people faced with unexpected and immeasurable perils than the President. As it stands, his record is the record of a man who might have been an average President in a calmer age, but was destroyed by the very opportunities which great events brought to him.

It is easy to be unjust in the moment of deep emotion. Mr. Wilson has not been a more complete failure in America

than Mr. Asquith was in Great Britain. His pathetic reliance upon the written word has not been more perilous to his country than the faith of Viviani in the spoken word. Contemptible as is our present national legislature, it is not more contemptible than that legislature which represents France in the most heroic moment of the French race.

The truth is that this great crisis in human history has inexorably destroyed most of the men in public life who sought to grapple with it and were exposed as impotent as a child in the presence of an avalanche. Actually the problems and the perils of this period have proven beyond the capacity of the statesmen of the hour. Mr. Wilson has failed like most others, because, like most others in all nations, he has been incapable of measuring the extent of the storm, and he has been unable to take his impulse from the great and enduring splendor of the mass of his fellow countrymen, but has continued to fear their selfishness instead of relying upon their patriotism.

British democracy, French democracy, both have failed quite as grievously as American in producing a statesman in this supreme hour. There is no man in any nation who measures up to the moment or stands disclosed as equal to the emergency. Those legislators in Senate and House who disgust us are not more contemptible than similar legislators in the House of Commons or the Chambre des Deputes. The truth is not to be mistaken; democracy has patently failed in the greatest crisis it has had to face. It has failed, and Mr. Wilson is not a more obvious evidence of the failure than those men, who, all unexpectedly, were called upon, as was he, to deal with a world storm they did not understand and could not measure.

To Mr. Wilson there has come a second chance, one of the rarest gifts of all that the gods bestow upon mankind. If he has learned, if he will lead, men will follow; but if he still finds it impossible to lead, if he still distrusts the patriotism of his fellow countrymen and takes the voice of cowardly politicians for the will of the masses of his countrymen, if he hesitates between brave words and the deeds that brave words demand, he will hereafter be remembered—or forgotten—as was Buchanan, the little man, the feeble man, infirm of purpose and incapable of action, who, to the terrible injury of his country, held power when a great storm gathered.

Mr. Wilson's personal fortunes are too intimately joined to the welfare and safety of his country to make it wise or expedient in the present hour to foreclose upon the future. He cannot do well without serving his country greatly; he cannot do ill without bringing suffering and harm to millions of his fellows. If he fails us now, his punishment will be great, but the suffering of his country will be greater. Thus it is that to-day our minds must be fixed rather on the future than on the past; we must hope, despite our fears, that the failure of the past will be compensated for by the success of the future. Our fate is for years and in a large measure in his hands.

Fifty-six years ago a President of the United States took office in the midst of the greatest crisis in our history. He made mistakes and he failed in much that he sought to do, but he learned through his failures; he found success, and in all the storm he never for a moment doubted the courage, the patriotism, the self-sacrifice of the millions who followed him. He remains our greatest American, and the consciousness of what Americans owe Abraham Lincoln grows with each succeeding generation. In the presence of a new national peril, only a degree less than that of half a century ago, will Mr. Wilson not see in the example of Lincoln the solution to his own and our problem?

Hopes and Fears of Submarine War

An estimate founded on the corrected lists of merchant vessels sunk in the first month of unrestricted submarine warfare shows that the total loss amounted to about 490,000 tons. This is somewhat greater than the figures published here day by day had led us to suppose, but still falls short by half of the German unofficial, or semi-official, forecast.

It would be imprudent on the strength of this comparison to conclude that the campaign had failed, for we have no way of telling how unfavorable the conditions for submarine war may have been during the month of February or what the possibilities of the future are. A comparison between this campaign and the campaign of two years ago makes it plain that the perils to merchant shipping are much greater to-day. Ruthlessness may be supposed to have reached its height when the Lusitania was sunk, yet the total number of ships destroyed in the following eight weeks hardly exceeded the number of neutrals alone destroyed in the four weeks of last month. Another important point to bear in mind is that if the Germans succeed in compelling neutrals to remain in harbor the primary purpose of their new campaign will be virtually achieved.

On the other side, it is evident that the proclamation of the new danger zones has not wrought so sudden a change as many enthusiasts in Germany expected. The losses of tonnage exceeded 322,000 in January and 346,000 in December; hence the extension of the prohibited area and the avowed indifference to neutrals, is not much more than 140,000 tons.

Many German writers have amused their readers with calculations designed to demonstrate the inevitability of British downfall, but as there are many factors of which they cannot possibly have any exact knowledge, it is idle to count on their reasonings. Percentages reckoned on the size of the commercial fleet before the war can lead to no useful conclusion, unless the conditions in the shipyards are understood and the possibilities of replacing lost tonnage duly taken into account. Lord Beresford lately produced

figures that were discouraging enough, but, as Lord Curzon pointed out, they might prove misleading unless other figures were considered simultaneously. For he went on to show that whereas at the outbreak of the war the British mercantile marine consisting of vessels over 1,600 gross tons numbered 3,890, with a total tonnage of 16,850,000, the total number on the first day of the new unrestricted campaign was 3,540, with a total tonnage barely short of 16,000,000. Hence in two years and a half of war the net loss from all causes was less than 10 per cent of the gross tonnage.

Call an Extra Session at Once!

The Tribune has no sympathy whatever with the motives of the Senators who talked the so-called armed neutrality bill to death. We urged Congress to grant the President all the powers he asked for after reducing them to positive, concrete form. We should have been glad to see Congress give him powers far exceeding those which he asked for. We believe that Congress should have declared war on Germany as soon as it learned that American lives had been lost through the murderous attack on the Laconia.

We regret the defeat of the armed neutrality bill, even though we think that a resort to armed neutrality would be a pitifully inadequate and unworthy answer to Germany's practical declaration of war on the United States. Under existing circumstances armed neutrality can be only a subterfuge and a fizzle. On Germany's part a state of war already exists. She is reaping all the benefits of that status and suffering none of its inconveniences. On our part a state of peace exists. We are suffering all the disadvantages of that status and reaping none of its benefits. The only possible way to rationalize the present situation is for the United States to declare war.

The President can still do on his own initiative some of the things which the armed neutrality bill would have authorized him to do. We hope that he will employ whatever powers he possesses under the Constitution to protect American lives and American shipping against German attacks. But it is evident that he cannot go by his own motion as far as the country's interests and honor require him to go. He will need the cooperation of the new Congress in a very large measure. Without its help he cannot properly prepare for the war which is at our door.

The two houses should therefore be called together at once. Several important appropriation bills failed when the armed neutrality bill failed. They will have to be passed. Moreover, we have not even made a start toward real military preparation. An officers' corps of 50,000 ought to be created without delay for our new army, also still to be created, and the framework of a modern military system must be set up.

The President said in his message of last Monday that he didn't want to call the new Congress in session because there might be a fight over the organization of the House of Representatives. But the new House must organize some time. The sooner the organization is effected the better. The 65th Congress ought to be put to work as quickly as possible, for it will have a vast amount of really constructive work to do. Every day's delay in calling the two houses together will therefore be to Germany's advantage and our disadvantage, since it will unnecessarily hinder the development of our military resources and the attainment of a reasonable condition of self-defense.

Washington's Efficiency Engineers

It cannot be too often or too strongly insisted that we shall never get the full efficiency out of the water taken from the Niagara River until permanent, common sense legislation warrants the great expense involved in taking advantage of modern hydroelectric engineering principles and methods. Once more with war threatening us and the country looking to Congress for legislation that will put us in the strongest position to face its strain, as well as that of the economic struggle which will follow it, our legislators have an opportunity to retrieve the disastrous failure of the past, blunders which have caused a power famine daily increasing in intensity and which the whole country will feel before many months are past. Will this opportunity be let slip for the sake of collecting a small revenue or to please the dupes of the monopoly-scammer? Every cent of tax of this kind is simply a hindrance to the attainment of the ideal of the efficient use of water power, and is surely borne by the electrochemical industries and those dependent on their products. For the purpose of collecting a small revenue the larger indirect revenue to be derived from the industries supplied by the hydro-electric power is sacrificed and the welfare of the whole country injured to an extent that it is impossible to estimate. Truly, the Washington efficiency engineer has a single eye to political conservation.

Experimental Sociology

Sociological experimentation is clearly in the pioneer stage of feeling its way. Collective activity is carried on by the trial and error method. There is a social selection of adapted ways analogous to the natural selection of adapted structures. But the selection of adapted ways is by two processes: Social selection, involving individual exclusion or extermination, and societal selection, involving constraint and social control. But social and societal selection are forms of collective experimentation by the trial and error method, since the results of so much social legislation are inconclusive. But when all the conditions of social problems have been discovered by the trial and error method may not the sociologist then pass on to the precise stage of the experimental method? The data of sociology are so complex and observations show such great variation that precise methods seem impossible. Is there, then, no way to overcome hindrances to precise methods of experimentation in sociology which are due to limited control and control of data? The statistical method helps to analyze out conditions of cause and effect and assists in overcoming the difficulties presented by complexity of data. In conclusion, the statistical method bears to scientific method in sociology much the same relation that the experimental method bears to precise method in physical science.

GERMAN INFLUENCE IN COLOMBIA

Threat of Attack Upon the Panama Canal Urges Passage of the Pending Treaty

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Two years ago dilettante Englishmen continued to play tennis and golf; amused themselves hunting and globe-trotting, and perched on "Britannia Rule the Waves, and that's our part." To-day Britain is in agony; the organization of the world is overthrown; the scrawny hand of bankruptcy is closing on great nations; civilization is tottering and America seems about to be drawn into the awful vortex. Do we want to confront, in addition to the Central Powers, the veiled or possibly open hostility of the Latin-American republics, or, as far as possible, present a united Pan-Americanism in defense of law and order?

I know Colombia as well as any living foreigner. There are in Colombia more German men than all other foreigners combined, and they include all the reserves who were prevented from embarking to go home and fight at the beginning of the war. Next in number to the Germans come the Turks. Practically all the French and English of military age have gone to the trenches. Up to September last, when I came from Colombia, the overwhelming sentiment in Colombia was pro-Ally, but nevertheless the German colony maintains at least three newspapers devoted exclusively to German propaganda, and in a dozen more buys regular editorial and news space in every issue. They are not fools, these German splendid fellows most of them, but they are not to be trusted. Their only purpose is to create a subconscious pro-German sentiment, ready to sub to flame if occasion requires.

The present treaty negotiations were started by President Taft and concluded by the present Administration. The time has come when personalities and partisanship must be subordinated to America's interest in the struggle for national life and human rights. Only to-day the man who would get a uddly win out, but we're going to get a damned good win out of this, and those who go to the aid of the Central Powers are not at liberty to give his name or quote the words he said in accordance with my views.

There is a smoldering resentment in Colombia against our government; there is a tremendous German propaganda; there is no pro-American propaganda; for ten years past Colombia has had forced military training, under German-trained Chilean officers' ing, under German-trained Chilean officers' instruction; there are German officers. It is inconceivable that the Central Powers might offer Colombia the return of Panama for the cooperation of her 300,000 men of military age. Is it inconceivable that, after a tremendous sinking of Allied ships or a notable victory on land Colombia might fall into the lure? Eventually it would mean her obliteration, but meanwhile how many hundreds of millions would it cost us, and how many thousands of lives? I am by no means sure that Colombia would yield to the temptation, but I know that the campaign to that end is on.

Colombia is a hundred times bigger than the Danish Islands. The canal is the world's greatest work, and will be profitable to us beyond dreams of usury. For Colombia's hearty friendship we would pay only what the distant little islands cost us, and that in a manner redounding to our direct benefit. Is it folly to pay our debt when the payment gives not only a receipt, but the good will of all the Latin republics? For several years past I have said nothing in regard to settlement with Colombia, but that is exactly the inherent sense of justice of the American people would clear up the question. But, under the circumstances, I feel that it would be unpatriotic, even criminal, treasonable, for me to keep silent regarding what I know and the inescapable logic of the situation.

We want preparedness and repentance. Italy, Turkey, Japan, Bulgaria and Rumania have been drawn into the war by promises from one and the other side. When we go in, apparently, it is inescapable that all the American republics will be drawn in, too. Do we want them on our side, or against us? A crisis of opposition to the Colombian treaty does not do credit to any thinking man, foreseeing American or United States Senator.

HENRY G. GRANGER.
New York, Feb. 28, 1917.

"A Heartrending and Ominous Spectacle"

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: It is my desire as a citizen to enter protest against the action of the Assembly of New York in voting to resubmit the issue of woman suffrage to the people of this state. At a time like this, when the country needs every available ounce of manhood, it is a distinctly saddening sight to see the Empire State in the hands of a feminized Legislature. Their action is not that of either a Democratic or Republican form of government, and it is an unfortunate day for us all when, against the wishes of a vast majority of the people of the state, our elected representatives yield weakly to the whims of a band of women obsessed by political ambitions.

This is no time to lessen the powers of government, no time to arouse a bitter internal controversy, and no time to consider a fundamental change to a system that both Colorado and California make evident has corrupted, weakened and undermined the strength of government.

It is indeed a heartrending and most ominous spectacle that a handful of power-mad women can so dominate the people's representatives that, to please these women, they deliberately aid their efforts to nullify the ballots of the men of this state.

What kind of manhood and conscience, if any, do these legislators possess? W. C. C.
New York, March 2, 1917.

Medical Education for Women

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: I enclose herewith a clipping from yesterday's Tribune, in which the headlines indicate that there is no first rate medical college in New York City open to women. The faculty of the Long Island College Hospital voted to open the college to women, and it was announced some time ago by about \$80 worth of advertising in The Tribune. The Long Island College Hospital requires hereafter two years of college study for the four-year medical course, thus putting its educational standard on a par with the majority of the university medical schools in this country. Columbia University is giving a two-year premedical college course here in Brooklyn for students intending to enter the Long Island College Hospital. This premedical course is also open to women.

OTTO V. HUFFMAN.
Brooklyn, N. Y., March 2, 1917.

"My Friends, Zimmermann and Hollweg"

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: The exposure in to-day's Tribune of the plots that were hatched in the German Embassy at Washington make very interesting reading. I hope the Germans will not capture Ambassador Gerard, for the American public will want to know more of his cordial and affectionate relations with "my friends, Zimmermann and von Bethmann-Hollweg" in January, 1917. W. G. CRENSHAW, Jr.
Orange, Va., March 1, 1917.

MOST IMPORTANT SHIPS OF THE NEW NAVY

A Correction, Together with Further Reflections on Our Battle-Cruisers and Other Items in the Naval Programme

By NAUTICUS

Kismet! For how else shall one explain why it is that, in the rare cases when a verbal error finds its way into the printed page, it so invariably lights upon the one word of all others which is essential to a clear understanding of the text? Thus I find myself saying in the last paragraph of my criticism of the new battle-cruisers in The Tribune of February 28: "Mr. Daniels and his advisers, against the opinion of the private shipbuilders, have adopted the 'geared' drive." It is needless to say that "geared" drive should read "electric" drive. Had the Navy Department adopted the geared drive, the contracts for these four ships would have been let many weeks ago, and for over one and a quarter million dollars less per ship than will be asked if the electric drive goes in.

What makes this defect in the battle-cruisers so surprising is the very high standard of excellence maintained by our naval constructors in the capital ships which they have designed during the last fifteen or twenty years. And particularly is this true of their defensive qualities—that is to say, their armor plate and the provisions against torpedo attack. Indeed, if some way can be found to get all the boiler plant below deck, these battle-cruisers will be so superior to any ships of their type abroad as to be in a class by themselves. Ships that can carry a battery of ten 50-calibre 14-inch guns into battle at a speed of thirty-five knots and receive the blow of two or three modern torpedoes and remain afloat are formidable indeed. Their under-water protection against mine and torpedo is superb, and their great speed and unusual helm power will render it extremely difficult to make a hit with the torpedo except at very short range.

Against the four battle-ships of the same programme (fiscal year 1917) there is absolutely no criticism to be made. They possess in a high degree the two characteristics which have made American battle-ships famous—heavy armor and powerful batteries. In thickness of armor they will probably exceed somewhat the Oklahoma and the Nevada, which, with 13½ inches of belt armor and eighteen inches on the turret, greatly exceeded all other ships of their type. The three battleships of the fiscal year 1918, however, will be far larger and more powerful than the 32,000-ton, 21-knot ships above described. They will embody the lessons of the war, particularly in the matter of speed, which will be raised from twenty-one to twenty-three knots. In the number of guns carried and in displacement they will exceed their predecessors by some 30 per cent, for they will mount the enormous battery of twelve 16-inch guns in four three-gun turrets. Moreover, the guns will greatly exceed the 16-inch pieces mounted in the 32,000-ton ships. They will be of 50-calibre length (or seven feet longer) and their velocity will be raised to 2,800 or 2,900 feet a second. This will bring the muzzle energy up to about 120,000 foot tons. This should be compared with the 14-inch gun carried by the Pennsylvania, whose muzzle energy is 76,200 foot tons. The total energy of a twelve-gun broadside from the Pennsylvania is 914,400 foot tons; whereas the broadside from the new 42,000-ton ships will have a total energy of 1,440,000 foot tons, or sufficient to lift the battleship Georgia bodily 100 feet into the air.

Next to the battleships and battle-cruisers, the most important ships of the new programme are the scouts, of which four are to be built this year and three in each of the two succeeding years. They will be very sufficiently fit for serious scouting duty, at least, in the modern acceptance of the term. Our 23-knot Birmingham, Salem and Chester are too slow for such work. The new scouts will be larger and faster than the scouts of foreign navies. They will displace 7,000 tons (as against 3,500 to 4,500 tons), and they will be driven by geared turbines at thirty-five knots. The armament will consist of 8-inch guns. But we should build at least thirty; ten will be insufficient.

GREED BEGETS WARS

Civilization Will Never Free Humanity from Danger of Them

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: I have read with great interest the recent letter from Professor Maurice Parmelee, of the political science department of our City College, on "The Danger of a Military Training." His arguments on the danger of universal military training are, I believe, fallacious, and only show the weakness of the stand taken by the pacifists. Any person who has studied the question at all knows that the history of the world is a series of wars fought mostly for the overthrow of tyrants and the gaining of freedom. The liberties of the Roman Empire were safe as long as every citizen was a trained soldier, but as that nation grew effeminate, and the people left the guarding of the country to a large standing army, then the people became slaves.

As long as human beings are consumed with greed, then wars will occur. Civilization alone has not freed, and never will free, the world from the dangers of war. Germany was supposed to be more highly developed intellectually than any other nation, yet the unjust and wholly unnecessary war was precipitated by that nation, and has shown that the people are as barbarous as their ancestors that overran Italy. The pacifist is a danger and a menace to the country, a moral coward and a traitor, who shirks his duty to his native land.

Professor Parmelee is right in decrying the danger of a large standing army. The history of the world has shown that a large standing army is a menace to the freedom of any country; and the only way we can combat the danger is for every person to be trained to arms. Then, when an army comes to power by ambition, undertakes to usurp the powers of the people the citizens trained to arms are prepared to meet the usurper and overthrow his power.

We know a large number of our military officers, trained at public expense, are inefficient and snobs and work to maintain the "caste system," so largely prevailing in the army, and who would gladly promote a war in order to secure faster promotion. Whose fault is it that this condition is allowed? The people's. It is not for the commanding officer or the military staff to say what this country shall do or not do—that remains for the citizens to decide.

We should demand the same efficient and faithful service of the army officer as we demand from the civilian employe. The officer is not our lord and master, as pictured by the pacifists, but our servant. If the pacifists would turn their energies to demanding efficient service on the part of the army officers, rather than doing away with the power of protecting themselves, they would accomplish something worth while, and not make themselves ridiculous.

We need an adequate standing army and we need a trained "citizen soldiery," not only to see that the army keeps its place and performs its legitimate duty, but also to turn out in case of invasion. We must recognize that wars will continue. The Bible shows this. Therefore, we should be prepared for wars, and if the pacifist would honestly study the situation he would see that our safety lay in the great citizen reserves, the "citizen soldiery." We should demand universal training. Every boy in the grammar school, in the high school and in the college should be efficiently trained in the use of arms. Then our National Guard should be more effective and retained under the control of the people.

The whole scheme of "national defence" was worked out nearly one hundred years ago by Captain Alden Partridge, a graduate of Dartmouth College and of the United States Military Academy of the class of 1806. He was professor at the academy from 1806 to 1815, and the fourth superintendent, serving from 1815 to 1817. He resigned from the army in 1818 to devote his life to the perfecting of his plan of education and the training of a citizen soldiery. He founded the Norwich University in 1819, the first technical college in the English-speaking world, and the first school for the training of the "citizen soldiery." He was the first officer and educator to recommend a practical plan for the preservation of our liberties. His lectures on "Education" and "National Defence," delivered in the early '20s, are, even at this date, in advance of the best thought of our educators and military authorities. These lectures are long out of print, but can be consulted at the New York Public Library, and will repay the study by every educator and military writer who wants to be "up to date." WILLIAM A. ELLIS.
New York, Feb. 22, 1917.

TREATY BY REFERENDUM

A Simple Remedy for All the Horrors of War

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: In his work on Democracy and Diplomacy (1916), Arthur Ponsonby, M. P., advocates a change in the treaty-making power. Instead of allowing the Prime Minister to make treaties, he would give Parliament the deciding voice. Such a change might answer the purpose for England, but in the minds of many there is great need of a more radical change in the foreign policy of this country. Considering our ventures in the making and unmaking of foreign treaties in recent years, it would seem to be the part of wisdom to have all treaties submitted to a popular vote. To those who object to such a new departure, I would point to the world war as an example of the appalling catastrophe which one self-willed man at the head of a government may bring upon his country.

In 1878 Russia had defeated Turkey a number of battles and her armies were knocking at the gates of Constantinople, when hostilities were brought to a close by the Treaty of San Stefano. By that treaty Turkey was hopelessly enmeshed, Bulgaria was restored to the Bulgarian Empire of the Middle Ages, other Balkan states were greatly strengthened and the Christian peoples of Armenia, Crete and other countries were guaranteed immunity from future massacre and spoliation at the hands of the Turkish butcher by being placed under the protection of Russia.

These arrangements, however, did not suit England. They constituted a menace to the balance of power, it was said. At a conference of the powers called by England and held at Berlin in June, 1878, the Treaty of San Stefano was almost completely nullified. Bulgaria, Montenegro and Serbia were deprived of all their recent gains, and the way was paved for the acquisition of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria. At the same time, Armenia and other Christian countries were handed back to the Turkish yoke. But it is not the treaties of the present war which are the full fruits of the Treaty of Berlin. By consenting to the substitution of that instrument for the Treaty of San Stefano Russia incurred the lasting hatred of Bulgaria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and instead of fighting with her in this war they are now arrayed against her. Greece, too, would have been with Russia instead of being unfriendly neutral. The Berlin treaty promoted that closer friendship between Turkey and Germany which has greatly strengthened the present coalition. If the Treaty of San Stefano had been allowed to stand, Armenia and the other Christian provinces would have been under the protection of Russia, and Turkey could not have made the enormous levies of men and supplies upon these provinces to carry on her campaign. These resources would have been available for Russia. Again, it is morally certain that, for the Berlin treaty, Constantinople, 1914, have been a Russian port long before 1914 and by the loss of that city and these Christian provinces Turkey would have been greatly weakened that she would not dare enter this war. And hence all the lives and money that have been sacrificed in the last and water campaigns against Turkey and Bulgaria would have been saved to Russia, England and France. All these troops, supplies, as well as those of Bulgaria, Armenia and Herzegovina, would have been available against Germany and Austria. Who can doubt the result? Is it not morally certain that these additional resources for the Entente Allies and with only two nations to fight, instead of four, as now, the contest would have been decided against Germany and Austria long before the end of 1915?

As it is, the bloody contest must go on. More millions of lives must be sacrificed; more billions of taxes must be levied on future generations to continue the struggle for existence. And whatever the additional sacrifice may be, the responsibility for all of it must rest upon the shoulders of one man—Benjamin Franklin.

It is the fate of war that it is a moral crime who originated the scheme to rob Russia and Bulgaria of the fruits of their victories, and to restore to the Turkish butcher his struggle hold on Christian nations—a hold which resulted in the slaughter of one million Armenian Christians from 1878 to 1914 and another million of the same nationality since the beginning of this war.

Israel's own party were not all in favor of his policy, and two members of his Cabinet, Lord Curzon and Lord Balfour, resigned rather than have anything to do with it. The Liberal party were a unit against the scheme and Gladstone bitterly denounced it. He declared that it was Israel's Crypto-Judaism—his hatred of Russia for her policy toward Jews—rather than his loyalty to England that dictated his policy. He was that the nobility of England welcomed home from the Berlin conference the minister who boasted that he brought "peace with honor." To-day the same English nobility, whose rank has been decorated in this war, realize that it was a "peace" with dishonor and destruction. The most fatal peace recorded in England's history. Never again will her people permit one man to determine her foreign policy. Every human life now being sacrificed and every dollar now being expended for this war may be justly charged to the Treaty of Berlin. England will heed the warning.

And other countries should heed this warning, especially the United States. The experience of recent years proves that Congress cannot be trusted in this matter. Our political parties are morally afraid of offending the foreign element; and they will often risk the welfare of the whole country in order to win the foreign-born vote. President Wilson in his famous "peace without victory" address has come forward with suggestions that the big nations should be compelled to let go their hold on the little nations. Such suggestions will certainly catch the foreign element. And Congress is all too ready to follow. But this is all the good it will do. The harm it may do cannot be foretold. Let us profit by England's troubles. Amend the Constitution and give the whole people a voice in the making and unmaking of all treaties with foreign countries.

WILLIAM HENRY.
New York, Feb. 27, 1917.

What Is President Wilson Waiting For?

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: The American people are fully aroused to the necessity of immediate action in defense of our nation. Then why this deadly hesitancy? What is President Wilson waiting for? Mass meetings should be held demanding a recognition of the people's rights, and, incidentally, demonstrate the fact that there are some who value justice, honor and liberty, even though our flag is now trailing in the dust. ANOTHER AMERICAN.
Essex Falls, N. J., March 1, 1917.

"Down to the Dregs"

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: The editorial in your issue of last week called "Down to the Dregs" is splendid. You have expressed the voice of the people and have done it well. WENTWORTH BYRON WINSLOW.
New York, March 1, 1917.